EXHIBIT D

In The Matter Of:

Misty Blanchette Porter, MD v.

Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center, et al.

Heather Gunnell Vol. 1 August 2, 2019 Confidential

Verbatim Reporters
(802)869-1665
verbatim@vermontel.net

Original File 8219GUNNELL.TXT
Min-U-Script® with Word Index

Page 3 of 13 Heather Gunnell - Vol. 1 August 2, 2019 2:17-cv-00194-kjd Misty Blanchette Porter, MD v. Document 139-6 Filed 01/29/20 Confidential

	tmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center, et al.			August 2, 2019
СО	N F I D E N T I A L Page 1	CC	NFIDENTIAL	Page 3
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF VERMONT Case No. 5:17-cv-194	1	INDEX OF EXAMINATION	
2		2	Witness Examined By	Page Line
3	MISTY BLANCHETTE PORTER, MD,)	3	Heather Gunnell Atty. Kramer	5 4
4 5	Plaintiff }	5		
6	VS. DARTMOUTH-HITCHCOCK MEDICAL CENTER	6	INDEX OF EXHIBITS	
7	DARTMOUTH-HITCHCOCK MEDICAL CENTER, DARTMOUTH-HITCHCOCK CLINIC, MARY HITCHCOCK MEMORIAL HOSPITAL, and DARTMOUTH-HITCHCOCK HEALTH,	7	INDEM OF EMILETIES	Page
8	,	8	1 - 7/6/15 Email Chain, DH0021277-78	55
9	Defendants)	9	2 - 5/7/16 Email Chain, DH0026525-26	65
10		10	3 - 5/13/16 Email Chain, DH0026723-24	l 66
11		11	4 - 2/16/17 Email Chain, DH0025441-42	
12	DEPOSITION	12	5 - 4/19/17 Email w/attachment DH0009582-83 6 - 4/19/17 Email w/attachment DH0009574-76	132
13 14	of HEATHER GUNNELL	13 14	6 - 4/19/17 Email w/attachment DH0009574-76 7 - 4/27/17 Email Chain, DH0008918-19	150 167
15	Volume I		/ - 4/2//1/ Email Chain, Dhoucesis-19	, 107
16	vorane 1	15		
17	Taken at the law offices of Vitt & Associates,	16		
18	PLC, 8 Beaver Meadow Road, Norwich, Vermont on	17 18	* * * *	
19	Friday, August 2, 2019 commencing at 10:00 a.m. before	19		
20	Sunnie Donath, RPR	20		
21		21		
22		22		
23		23		
24		24		
25		25		
	Verbatim Reporters (802)869-1665 verbatim@vermontel.net		Verbatim Reporte (802)869-1665 verbatim@vermontel	rs .net
СО	N F I D E N T I A L Page 2	СС) N F I D E N T I A L	Page 4
C O	N F I D E N T I A L Page 2 APPEARANCES:	СС	ONFIDENTIAL	Page 4
	APPEARANCES:	C C	STIPULATIONS	-
1 2 3	APPEARANCES:	1 2	STIPULATIONS It is hereby stipulated and agreed	d by and
1 2 3 4	APPEARANCES:	1 2 3	STIPULATIONS It is hereby stipulated and agreed between the attorneys of record for the strong stro	d by and
1 2 3 4 5	APPEARANCES: GEOFFREY J. VITT, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE Vitt & Associates, PLC 8 Beaver Meadow Road, PO Box 1229 Norwich, Vermont 05055 On behalf of the Plaintiff	1 2 3	STIPULATIONS It is hereby stipulated and agreed between the attorneys of record for the parties hereto as follows:	d by and he respective
1 2 3 4	APPEARANCES: GEOFFREY J. VITT, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE Vitt & Associates, PLC 8 Beaver Meadow Road, PO Box 1229 Norwich, Vermont 05055 On behalf of the Plaintiff	1 2 3 4 5	STIPULATIONS It is hereby stipulated and agreed between the attorneys of record for the parties hereto as follows: 1. That the testimony of HEATHER Control of the stimulation of the s	d by and he respective
1 2 3 4 5 6	APPEARANCES: GEOFFREY J. VITT, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE Vitt & Associates, PLC 8 Beaver Meadow Road, PO Box 1229 Norwich, Vermont 05055 On behalf of the Plaintiff KATHERINE BURGHARDT KRAMER, ESQUIRE KBK Law, 6 Mill Street PO Box 23, Middlebury, Vermont 05753 On behalf of the Plaintiff	1 2 3 4 5 6	STIPULATIONS It is hereby stipulated and agreed between the attorneys of record for the parties hereto as follows: 1. That the testimony of HEATHER Cotaken pursuant to the Federal Rules of	d by and he respective GUNNELL may be Civil Procedure,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	APPEARANCES: GEOFFREY J. VITT, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE Vitt & Associates, PLC 8 Beaver Meadow Road, PO Box 1229 Norwich, Vermont 05055 On behalf of the Plaintiff KATHERINE BURGHARDT KRAMER, ESQUIRE KBK Law, 6 Mill Street PO Box 23, Middlebury, Vermont 05753 On behalf of the Plaintiff	1 2 3 4 5 6	STIPULATIONS It is hereby stipulated and agreed between the attorneys of record for the parties hereto as follows: 1. That the testimony of HEATHER Contaken pursuant to the Federal Rules of and treated as if taken pursuant to not	d by and he respective GUNNELL may be Civil Procedure, tice and order to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	APPEARANCES: GEOFFREY J. VITT, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE Vitt & Associates, PLC 8 Beaver Meadow Road, PO Box 1229 Norwich, Vermont 05055 On behalf of the Plaintiff KATHERINE BURGHARDT KRAMER, ESQUIRE KBK Law, 6 Mill Street PO Box 23, Middlebury, Vermont 05753 On behalf of the Plaintiff	1 2 3 4 5 6	STIPULATIONS It is hereby stipulated and agreed between the attorneys of record for the parties hereto as follows: 1. That the testimony of HEATHER Contact taken pursuant to the Federal Rules of and treated as if taken pursuant to not take depositions and that all formalities.	d by and he respective GUNNELL may be Civil Procedure, tice and order to les of notice and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	APPEARANCES: GEOFFREY J. VITT, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE Vitt & Associates, PLC 8 Beaver Meadow Road, PO Box 1229 Norwich, Vermont 05055 On behalf of the Plaintiff	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	STIPULATIONS It is hereby stipulated and agreed between the attorneys of record for the parties hereto as follows: 1. That the testimony of HEATHER Contaken pursuant to the Federal Rules of and treated as if taken pursuant to not	d by and he respective GUNNELL may be Civil Procedure, tice and order to les of notice and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	APPEARANCES: GEOFFREY J. VITT, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE Vitt & Associates, PLC 8 Beaver Meadow Road, PO Box 1229 Norwich, Vermont 05055 On behalf of the Plaintiff KATHERINE BURGHARDT KRAMER, ESQUIRE KBK Law, 6 Mill Street PO Box 23, Middlebury, Vermont 05753 On behalf of the Plaintiff	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	STIPULATIONS It is hereby stipulated and agreed between the attorneys of record for the parties hereto as follows: 1. That the testimony of HEATHER Contact taken pursuant to the Federal Rules of and treated as if taken pursuant to not take depositions and that all formalities.	d by and he respective GUNNELL may be Civil Procedure, tice and order to les of notice and he signatures to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	APPEARANCES: GEOFFREY J. VITT, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE Vitt & Associates, PLC 8 Beaver Meadow Road, PO Box 1229 Norwich, Vermont 05055 On behalf of the Plaintiff KATHERINE BURGHARDT KRAMER, ESQUIRE KBK Law, 6 Mill Street PO Box 23, Middlebury, Vermont 05753 On behalf of the Plaintiff	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	STIPULATIONS It is hereby stipulated and agreed between the attorneys of record for the parties hereto as follows: 1. That the testimony of HEATHER Contaken pursuant to the Federal Rules of and treated as if taken pursuant to not take depositions and that all formalitic order are waived by the parties, and to the stipulation are in like manner was	d by and he respective GUNNELL may be Civil Procedure, tice and order to les of notice and he signatures to ived;
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	APPEARANCES: GEOFFREY J. VITT, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE VITT & Associates, PLC 8 Beaver Meadow Road, PO Box 1229 Norwich, Vermont 05055 On behalf of the Plaintiff KATHERINE BURGHARDT KRAMER, ESQUIRE KEK Law, 6 Mill Street PO BOX 23, Middlebury, Vermont 05753 On behalf of the Plaintiff JESSICA E. JOSEPH, ESQUIRE Foley & Lardner, LLP 111 Runtington Avenue, Suite 2500 Boston, Massachusetts 02199-7610 On behalf of the Defendants	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	STIPULATIONS It is hereby stipulated and agreed between the attorneys of record for the parties hereto as follows: 1. That the testimony of HEATHER Contaken pursuant to the Federal Rules of and treated as if taken pursuant to not take depositions and that all formalitic order are waived by the parties, and the stipulation are in like manner was 2. That all objections except as	d by and he respective GUNNELL may be Civil Procedure, tice and order to les of notice and he signatures to ived; to matters of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	APPEARANCES: GEOFFREY J. VITT, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE VITT & Associates, PLC 8 Beaver Meadow Road, PO Box 1229 Norwich, Vermont 05055 On behalf of the Plaintiff KATHERINE BURGHARDT KRAMER, ESQUIRE KEK Law, 6 Mill Street PO BOX 23, Middlebury, Vermont 05753 On behalf of the Plaintiff JESSICA E. JOSEPH, ESQUIRE Foley & Lardner, LLP 111 Runtington Avenue, Suite 2500 Boston, Massachusetts 02199-7610 On behalf of the Defendants	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	STIPULATIONS It is hereby stipulated and agreed between the attorneys of record for the parties hereto as follows: 1. That the testimony of HEATHER Contaken pursuant to the Federal Rules of and treated as if taken pursuant to not take depositions and that all formalitic order are waived by the parties, and the stipulation are in like manner was 2. That all objections except as form are reserved until the deposition	d by and he respective GUNNELL may be Civil Procedure, tice and order to les of notice and he signatures to ived; to matters of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	APPEARANCES: GEOFFREY J. VITT, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE VITT & Associates, PLC 8 Beaver Meadow Road, PO Box 1229 Norwich, Vermont 05055 On behalf of the Plaintiff KATHERINE BURGHARDT KRAMER, ESQUIRE KEK Law, 6 Mill Street PO BOX 23, Middlebury, Vermont 05753 On behalf of the Plaintiff JESSICA E. JOSEPH, ESQUIRE Foley & Lardner, LLP 111 Runtington Avenue, Suite 2500 Boston, Massachusetts 02199-7610 On behalf of the Defendants	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	STIPULATIONS It is hereby stipulated and agreed between the attorneys of record for the parties hereto as follows: 1. That the testimony of HEATHER Contaken pursuant to the Federal Rules of and treated as if taken pursuant to not take depositions and that all formalitic order are waived by the parties, and the stipulation are in like manner was 2. That all objections except as form are reserved until the deposition thereof is offered in evidence;	d by and he respective GUNNELL may be Civil Procedure, tice and order to ies of notice and he signatures to ived; to matters of n or any part
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	APPEARANCES: GEOFFREY J. VITT, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE VITT & Associates, PLC 8 Beaver Meadow Road, PO Box 1229 Norwich, Vermont 05055 On behalf of the Plaintiff KATHERINE BURGHARDT KRAMER, ESQUIRE KEK Law, 6 Mill Street PO BOX 23, Middlebury, Vermont 05753 On behalf of the Plaintiff JESSICA E. JOSEPH, ESQUIRE Foley & Lardner, LLP 111 Runtington Avenue, Suite 2500 Boston, Massachusetts 02199-7610 On behalf of the Defendants	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	STIPULATIONS It is hereby stipulated and agreed between the attorneys of record for the parties hereto as follows: 1. That the testimony of HEATHER Contaken pursuant to the Federal Rules of and treated as if taken pursuant to not take depositions and that all formalitic order are waived by the parties, and to the stipulation are in like manner was 2. That all objections except as form are reserved until the deposition thereof is offered in evidence; 3. That the deposition may be significant to the stipulation and the stipulation are in the deposition thereof is offered in evidence;	d by and he respective GUNNELL may be Civil Procedure, tice and order to ites of notice and the signatures to ived; to matters of n or any part
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	APPEARANCES: GEOFFREY J. VITT, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE VITT & Associates, PLC 8 Beaver Meadow Road, PO Box 1229 Norwich, Vermont 05055 On behalf of the Plaintiff KATHERINE BURGHARDT KRAMER, ESQUIRE KEK Law, 6 Mill Street PO BOX 23, Middlebury, Vermont 05753 On behalf of the Plaintiff JESSICA E. JOSEPH, ESQUIRE Foley & Lardner, LLP 111 Runtington Avenue, Suite 2500 Boston, Massachusetts 02199-7610 On behalf of the Defendants	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	STIPULATIONS It is hereby stipulated and agreed between the attorneys of record for the parties hereto as follows: 1. That the testimony of HEATHER Contaken pursuant to the Federal Rules of and treated as if taken pursuant to not take depositions and that all formalitic order are waived by the parties, and the stipulation are in like manner was 2. That all objections except as form are reserved until the deposition thereof is offered in evidence;	d by and he respective GUNNELL may be Civil Procedure, tice and order to ites of notice and the signatures to ived; to matters of n or any part
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	APPEARANCES: GEOFFREY J. VITT, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE VITT & Associates, PLC 8 Beaver Meadow Road, PO Box 1229 Norwich, Vermont 05055 On behalf of the Plaintiff KATHERINE BURGHARDT KRAMER, ESQUIRE KEK Law, 6 Mill Street PO BOX 23, Middlebury, Vermont 05753 On behalf of the Plaintiff JESSICA E. JOSEPH, ESQUIRE Foley & Lardner, LLP 111 Runtington Avenue, Suite 2500 Boston, Massachusetts 02199-7610 On behalf of the Defendants	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	STIPULATIONS It is hereby stipulated and agreed between the attorneys of record for the parties hereto as follows: 1. That the testimony of HEATHER Contaken pursuant to the Federal Rules of and treated as if taken pursuant to not take depositions and that all formalitic order are waived by the parties, and to the stipulation are in like manner was 2. That all objections except as form are reserved until the deposition thereof is offered in evidence; 3. That the deposition may be significant to the stipulation and the stipulation are in the deposition thereof is offered in evidence;	d by and he respective GUNNELL may be Civil Procedure, tice and order to ites of notice and the signatures to ived; to matters of n or any part
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	APPEARANCES: GEOFFREY J. VITT, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE VITT & Associates, PLC 8 Beaver Meadow Road, PO Box 1229 Norwich, Vermont 05055 On behalf of the Plaintiff KATHERINE BURGHARDT KRAMER, ESQUIRE KEK Law, 6 Mill Street PO BOX 23, Middlebury, Vermont 05753 On behalf of the Plaintiff JESSICA E. JOSEPH, ESQUIRE Foley & Lardner, LLP 111 Runtington Avenue, Suite 2500 Boston, Massachusetts 02199-7610 On behalf of the Defendants	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	STIPULATIONS It is hereby stipulated and agreed between the attorneys of record for the parties hereto as follows: 1. That the testimony of HEATHER Contaken pursuant to the Federal Rules of and treated as if taken pursuant to not take depositions and that all formalitic order are waived by the parties, and to the stipulation are in like manner was 2. That all objections except as form are reserved until the deposition thereof is offered in evidence; 3. That the deposition may be significant to the stipulation and the stipulation are in the deposition thereof is offered in evidence;	d by and he respective GUNNELL may be Civil Procedure, tice and order to ites of notice and the signatures to ived; to matters of n or any part
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	APPEARANCES: GEOFFREY J. VITT, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE VITT & Associates, PLC 8 Beaver Meadow Road, PO Box 1229 Norwich, Vermont 05055 On behalf of the Plaintiff KATHERINE BURGHARDT KRAMER, ESQUIRE KEK Law, 6 Mill Street PO BOX 23, Middlebury, Vermont 05753 On behalf of the Plaintiff JESSICA E. JOSEPH, ESQUIRE Foley & Lardner, LLP 111 Runtington Avenue, Suite 2500 Boston, Massachusetts 02199-7610 On behalf of the Defendants	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	STIPULATIONS It is hereby stipulated and agreed between the attorneys of record for the parties hereto as follows: 1. That the testimony of HEATHER Contaken pursuant to the Federal Rules of and treated as if taken pursuant to not take depositions and that all formalitic order are waived by the parties, and to the stipulation are in like manner was 2. That all objections except as form are reserved until the deposition thereof is offered in evidence; 3. That the deposition may be significant to the stipulation and the stipulation are in the deposition thereof is offered in evidence;	d by and he respective GUNNELL may be Civil Procedure, tice and order to ites of notice and the signatures to ived; to matters of n or any part
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	APPEARANCES: GEOFFREY J. VITT, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE VITT & Associates, PLC 8 Beaver Meadow Road, PO Box 1229 Norwich, Vermont 05055 On behalf of the Plaintiff KATHERINE BURGHARDT KRAMER, ESQUIRE KEK Law, 6 Mill Street PO BOX 23, Middlebury, Vermont 05753 On behalf of the Plaintiff JESSICA E. JOSEPH, ESQUIRE Foley & Lardner, LLP 111 Runtington Avenue, Suite 2500 Boston, Massachusetts 02199-7610 On behalf of the Defendants	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	STIPULATIONS It is hereby stipulated and agreed between the attorneys of record for the parties hereto as follows: 1. That the testimony of HEATHER Contaken pursuant to the Federal Rules of and treated as if taken pursuant to not take depositions and that all formalitic order are waived by the parties, and to the stipulation are in like manner was 2. That all objections except as form are reserved until the deposition thereof is offered in evidence; 3. That the deposition may be signed the stipulation of the stipulation are in the deposition of the stipulation are in like manner was as form are reserved until the deposition thereof is offered in evidence; 3. That the deposition may be signed the stipulation of the stipulat	d by and he respective GUNNELL may be Civil Procedure, tice and order to ites of notice and the signatures to ived; to matters of n or any part
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	APPEARANCES: GEOFFREY J. VITT, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE VITT & Associates, PLC 8 Beaver Meadow Road, PO Box 1229 Norwich, Vermont 05055 On behalf of the Plaintiff KATHERINE BURGHARDT KRAMER, ESQUIRE KEK Law, 6 Mill Street PO BOX 23, Middlebury, Vermont 05753 On behalf of the Plaintiff JESSICA E. JOSEPH, ESQUIRE Foley & Lardner, LLP 111 Runtington Avenue, Suite 2500 Boston, Massachusetts 02199-7610 On behalf of the Defendants	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	STIPULATIONS It is hereby stipulated and agreed between the attorneys of record for the parties hereto as follows: 1. That the testimony of HEATHER Contaken pursuant to the Federal Rules of and treated as if taken pursuant to not take depositions and that all formalitic order are waived by the parties, and to the stipulation are in like manner was 2. That all objections except as form are reserved until the deposition thereof is offered in evidence; 3. That the deposition may be significant to the stipulation and the stipulation are in the deposition thereof is offered in evidence;	d by and he respective GUNNELL may be Civil Procedure, tice and order to ites of notice and the signatures to ived; to matters of n or any part
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	APPEARANCES: GEOFFREY J. VITT, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE VITT & Associates, PLC 8 Beaver Meadow Road, PO Box 1229 Norwich, Vermont 05055 On behalf of the Plaintiff KATHERINE BURGHARDT KRAMER, ESQUIRE KEK Law, 6 Mill Street PO BOX 23, Middlebury, Vermont 05753 On behalf of the Plaintiff JESSICA E. JOSEPH, ESQUIRE Foley & Lardner, LLP 111 Runtington Avenue, Suite 2500 Boston, Massachusetts 02199-7610 On behalf of the Defendants	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	STIPULATIONS It is hereby stipulated and agreed between the attorneys of record for the parties hereto as follows: 1. That the testimony of HEATHER Contaken pursuant to the Federal Rules of and treated as if taken pursuant to not take depositions and that all formalitic order are waived by the parties, and to the stipulation are in like manner was 2. That all objections except as form are reserved until the deposition thereof is offered in evidence; 3. That the deposition may be signed the stipulation of the stipulation are in the deposition of the stipulation are in like manner was as form are reserved until the deposition thereof is offered in evidence; 3. That the deposition may be signed the stipulation of the stipulat	d by and he respective GUNNELL may be Civil Procedure, tice and order to ites of notice and the signatures to ived; to matters of n or any part
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	APPEARANCES: GEOFFREY J. VITT, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE VITT & Associates, PLC 8 Beaver Meadow Road, PO Box 1229 Norwich, Vermont 05055 On behalf of the Plaintiff KATHERINE BURGHARDT KRAMER, ESQUIRE KEK Law, 6 Mill Street PO BOX 23, Middlebury, Vermont 05753 On behalf of the Plaintiff JESSICA E. JOSEPH, ESQUIRE Foley & Lardner, LLP 111 Runtington Avenue, Suite 2500 Boston, Massachusetts 02199-7610 On behalf of the Defendants	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	STIPULATIONS It is hereby stipulated and agreed between the attorneys of record for the parties hereto as follows: 1. That the testimony of HEATHER Contaken pursuant to the Federal Rules of and treated as if taken pursuant to not take depositions and that all formalitic order are waived by the parties, and to the stipulation are in like manner was 2. That all objections except as form are reserved until the deposition thereof is offered in evidence; 3. That the deposition may be signed the stipulation of the stipulation are in the deposition of the stipulation are in like manner was as form are reserved until the deposition thereof is offered in evidence; 3. That the deposition may be signed the stipulation of the stipulat	d by and he respective GUNNELL may be Civil Procedure, tice and order to ites of notice and the signatures to ived; to matters of n or any part
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	APPEARANCES: GEOFFREY J. VITT, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE Vitt & Associates, PLC 8 Beaver Meadow Road, PO Box 1229 Norwich, Vermont 05055 On behalf of the Plaintiff KATHERINE BURGHARDT KRAMER, ESQUIRE KBK Law, 6 Mill Street PO BOX 23, Middlebury, Vermont 05753 On behalf of the Plaintiff JESSICA E. JOSEPH, ESQUIRE FOLEY & Lardner, LLP 111 Huntington Avenue, Suite 2500 Boston, Massachusetts 02199-7610 Boston, On behalf of the Defendants Also Present: Misty Blanchette Porter, MD	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	STIPULATIONS It is hereby stipulated and agreed between the attorneys of record for the parties hereto as follows: 1. That the testimony of HEATHER Contaken pursuant to the Federal Rules of and treated as if taken pursuant to not take depositions and that all formalitic order are waived by the parties, and to the stipulation are in like manner was 2. That all objections except as form are reserved until the deposition thereof is offered in evidence; 3. That the deposition may be signed the stipulation of the stipulation are in the deposition of the stipulation are in like manner was as form are reserved until the deposition thereof is offered in evidence; 3. That the deposition may be signed the stipulation of the stipulat	d by and he respective GUNNELL may be Civil Procedure, tice and order to ites of notice and the signatures to ived; to matters of n or any part
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	APPEARANCES: GEOFFREY J. VITT, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE Vitt & Associates, PLC 8 Beaver Meadow Road, PO Box 1229 Norwich, Vermont 05055 On behalf of the Plaintiff KATHERINE BURGHARDT KRAMER, ESQUIRE KBK Law, 6 Mill Street PO BOX 23, Middlebury, Vermont 05753 On behalf of the Plaintiff JESSICA E. JOSEPH, ESQUIRE FOLEY & Lardner, LLP 111 Huntington Avenue, Suite 2500 Boston, Massachusetts 02199-7610 Boston, On behalf of the Defendants Also Present: Misty Blanchette Porter, MD	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	STIPULATIONS It is hereby stipulated and agreed between the attorneys of record for the parties hereto as follows: 1. That the testimony of HEATHER Contaken pursuant to the Federal Rules of and treated as if taken pursuant to not take depositions and that all formalitic order are waived by the parties, and to the stipulation are in like manner was 2. That all objections except as form are reserved until the deposition thereof is offered in evidence; 3. That the deposition may be signed the stipulation of the stipulation are in the deposition of the stipulation are in like manner was as form are reserved until the deposition thereof is offered in evidence; 3. That the deposition may be signed the stipulation of the stipulat	d by and he respective GUNNELL may be Civil Procedure, tice and order to ites of notice and the signatures to ived; to matters of n or any part
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	APPEARANCES: GEOFFREY J. VITT, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE SARAH H. NUNAN, ESQUIRE VITT & Associates, PLC 8 Beaver Meadow Road, PO Box 1229 Norwich, Vermont 05055 On behalf of the Plaintiff KATHERINE BURGHARDT KRAMER, ESQUIRE KEK Law, 6 Mill Street PO BOX 23, Middlebury, Vermont 05753 On behalf of the Plaintiff JESSICA E. JOSEPH, ESQUIRE Foley & Lardner, LLP 111 Runtington Avenue, Suite 2500 Boston, Massachusetts 02199-7610 On behalf of the Defendants	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	STIPULATIONS It is hereby stipulated and agreed between the attorneys of record for the parties hereto as follows: 1. That the testimony of HEATHER Contaken pursuant to the Federal Rules of and treated as if taken pursuant to not take depositions and that all formalitic order are waived by the parties, and to the stipulation are in like manner was 2. That all objections except as form are reserved until the deposition thereof is offered in evidence; 3. That the deposition may be signed the stipulation of the stipulation are in the deposition of the stipulation are in like manner was as form are reserved until the deposition thereof is offered in evidence; 3. That the deposition may be signed the stipulation of the stipulat	d by and he respective GUNNELL may be Civil Procedure, tice and order to ites of notice and the signatures to ived; to matters of n or any part

Misty Blanchette Porter, MD v. Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center, et al. Heather Gunnell - Vol. 1 August 2, 2019

Page 43

Page 44

CONFIDENTIAL

- of years.
- 2 Q. How did you know how to handle the job? It sounds
- like it was, it was a little bit different from what
- you had done previously. When you showed up as the
- practice manager, how did you get trained? What did
- you, what did you do to learn how to fill the job?
- 7 A. The, I'm, I'm chuckling because it's a long
- process. Yes, there was a fair amount of training.
- Karen had put together a, you know, really
- comprehensive, You need to meet with all of these 10
- people and go through this. I did a lot of listening. 11
- I met with everyone who would meet with me to talk to 12
- them. I went through some Lean Six Sigma training to 13
- be able to learn how to do that better. But I, I had a 14
- 15 long history of management and program management, and
- I did not go into that job completely green. 16
- Q. What is Lean Six Sigma?
- A. It's a process improvement methodology.
- 19 Q. Do you know anything about the origins of Lean Six
- Sigma? 20
- 21 A. I, I can't recall all those details right now.
- 22 Q. Do you remember -- what do you remember from that
- training?
- 24 A. I remember a lot of focus on the, the process of
- trying to ascertain and come to a root cause, the

CONFIDENTIAL

- 1 A. I don't know. We would, we would get together
- about once a year to celebrate our new work, like, our
- work anniversary, and we were friendly.
- 4 Q. Why her and not the other providers in the
- department?
- A. I don't know.
- Q. Was there something different about your
- relationship with her?
- A. I got along quite well with Dr. Tyler.
- 10 Q. Why do you think that is?
- 11 A. Our personalities clicked. We started at the same
- time, and so we were both trying to figure out and
- navigate the Dartmouth-Hitchcock system together, and I
- worked with her a lot with her division.
- 15 Q. Did you exchange text messages with any of the
- other providers? 16
- A. Probably occasionally but nothing of note. The
- similar type of running late for a meeting, etc.
- Q. Do you give out your cell phone number to work
- colleagues?
- 21 A. Yes.
- Q. Why is that?
- A. So that they can reach me when they need me.
- 24 Q. Let's, let's focus on 2014 when Dr. Hsu, Albert
- Hsu, joined REI.

CONFIDENTIAL

Page 42

CONFIDENTIAL

1 A. Okay.

- 2 Q. Who is Dr. Hsu?
- 3 A. Dr. Hsu was an REI provider who came on board the
- REI division right after his fellowship.
- 5 Q. And do you remember when it was that you first met
- Dr. Hsu?
- A. I met him when he started working at
- Dartmouth-Hitchcock.
- **9** Q. I believe that was at some point in 2014. Do you
- remember when specifically?
- 11 A. I don't remember when specifically.
- 12 Q. What was your initial impression of Dr. Hsu?
- 13 A. He seemed like a very nice guy.
- **14** Q. Anything else?
- 15 A. No.
- 16 Q. Did your impression of him change over time?
- 17 A. Yes.
- **18** O. How so?
- 19 A. The more I got to know Albert, the more, Dr. Hsu,
- the more I realized that he took a fair amount of
- managing. 21
- 22 Q. What sort of managing?
- 23 A. He was very high need and very -- he communicated
- a lot, so it would take a lot of conversations with him
- to suss out what he needed from me and what we could do

- process of gathering data and including your team and
- change management. It's a very comprehensive. It was
- about a year process that I went through.
- **4** Q. A year of training?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Is that a continual process? Have you done more
- Lean Six Sigma training since the beginning?
- 8 A. No.
- **9** Q. And is that a, a management philosophy that's
- embraced by the institution overall?
- 11 A. That's correct.
- ATTORNEY KRAMER: Is it okay to take a quick 12
- break? 13
- (A recess was taken from 10:50 a.m. to 11:04 a.m.) 14
- BY ATTORNEY KRAMER:
- Q. You had testified earlier that you exchanged text
- messages with Regan Tyler?
- 18 A. Yes.
- **19** Q. Who is Regan Tyler?
- 20 A. She was the division director for the generalist
- division. 21
- 22 Q. How long did you work with Dr. Tyler?
- 23 A. I don't remember exactly when she left, but three
- to four years.
- 25 Q. Why did you exchange text messages with her?

Misty Blanchette Porter, MD v.

Confidential Heather Gunnell - Vol. 1 Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center, et al. August 2, 2019

whatever actions that team of people decided were

necessary. 2

CONFIDENTIAL

- (Deposition Exhibit 2 marked.) 3
- 4 Q. Let me show you -- this will marked as Exhibit 2.
- This has been -- did you have a chance to read it?
- A. Um-hum.
- Q. Yes?
- 8 A. Yes. Well, I was finishing. Yes, I have read
- 9
- 10 Q. Okay. So this has been marked as Gunnell Exhibit
- 2, DH26525 and 26. It's an email chain regarding an 11
- issue with a patient, MK. The top email is Dr. Hsu
- sending this to you. Having reviewed this email chain, 13
- 14 what's your understanding of why Dr. Hsu was sending
- this to you? 15
- A. I know he had spoken to me in person about this 16
- patient, and it, so I think he was sending this to me
- to just loop me into the broader conversation he was 18
- having. 19
- **20** Q. What did you understand the situation to be?
- 21 A. At this point, I don't remember exactly.
- 22 O. I have another document I'll show you in just a
- sec that may explain it a little more. We'll see. It 23
- 24 says here in the middle of the page, there's an email
- from Navid Esfandiari to Dr. Hsu and Sharon Parent

CONFIDENTIAL Page 66 CONFIDENTIAL

- where Navid says, "The confusion was due to lack of
- documentation in BBS". What is BBS?
- 3 A. BabySentry. It is the REI-specific electronic
- medical record that the REI division and the lab used.
- 5 Q. And what's your understanding of who was
- responsible for the lack of documentation?
- A. In this particular instance, I do not know.
- Q. Do you know if it was Dr. Hsu?
- A. I don't know.
- Q. And let's mark this as Exhibit 3. Let me know 10
- when you've had a chance to review it. 11
- (Deposition Exhibit 3 marked.) 12
- A. Okay, okay. 13
- 14 Q. Okay. So this is an email chain from May 13th
- 2016, which is around the same time period as the
- documents we were looking at in Exhibit 2 --16
- A. Um-hum. 17
- Q. -- DH26723 and 24. In this email chain, it starts 18
- 19 with Albert Hsu emailing you and Karen Boedtker about a
- situation involving patient MK, and it says that you 20
- and Heather -- it says that, "Heather and I had the 21
- opportunity to meet with the patient yesterday". 22
- 23 Do you recall that, that situation of meeting with a patient with Dr. Hsu?
- 25 A. Yes.

1 Q. What do you recall?

CONFIDENTIAL

A. I recall late that afternoon Albert coming down to

Page 67

- my office to see if I had time to meet with this
- patient who was very upset. I recall going into the
- room and listening to the patient and her husband talk
- to me about their dissatisfaction with the, with the 6
- 7 communication from the division at that point. I
- recall them saying that there were some specific people 8
- in that division that they did not want to receive care
- from any further, and I remember talking to them about 10
- 11 trying to understand what they were comfortable with
- 12 moving forward.
- Q. How common was it for you to meet directly with 13
- patients?
- 15 A. It was not uncommon when there were patient
- complaints. It was uncommon for a provider to come get
- me and bring me down to the exam room to meet with a
- 18 patient.
- 19 Q. And in this situation Dr. Hsu came to get you?
- Yes. 20 A.
- 21 Q. Why did he come get you?
- A. The, the patient and her husband were incredibly
- upset and wanted to be able to talk to somebody.
- Q. Looking at the, the second page of this, Dr. Hsu
- says that he is thinking of emailing both of you,

Page 68

- meaning you and Karen Boedtker, with a draft of the
- note that he would put into the medical records. Is
- that an unusual thing to do? 3
- A. Yes.
- Q. Do you think that's an appropriate thing to do or
- inappropriate?
- A. I don't know. This was a pretty unusual situation
- where he wasn't -- typically, it's not appropriate for
- 9 a practice manager to be consulted on a clinical note.
- In this situation, because it was primarily a patient
- complaint, he seemed to think that he wanted some, some
- extra eyes on it. It's not something I typically do.
- Q. And, in this email at the, at the top of Exhibit 3, you say that you were going to make a similar change
- to the language. My interpretation of this is that you
- were, you were therefore involved in crafting the 16
- language that would go into the note. 17
- A. I was not involved in crafting the language. I
- remember wanting to make sure that the providers who
- they were complaining about not be named in that 20
- clinical note and that, if there was going to be a 21
- 23 patient relations rather than in the medical record.
- Q. You mentioned that these patients did not want to

complaint about providers, that that go through risk or

be treated by certain providers. Which providers?

22

Heather Gunnell - Vol. 1
August 2, 2019

CONFIDENTIAL

Page 69 CONFIDENTIAL

Page 71

- 1 A. They did not want to be treated by the nurse,
- 2 Sharon Parent, and they did not want to see Dr. Porter,
- 3 and they also had complaints about Elizabeth Todd, if I
- 4 remember correctly.
- 5 Q. What were their complaints about Dr. Porter?
- 6 A. I don't remember specifically.
- **7** Q. Do you remember generally?
- 8 A. I remember generally they didn't like the way they
- 9 were treated, not necessarily clinically, but the
- 10 interpersonal dynamic.
- 11 Q. Who is Karen Boedtker?
- 12 A. Karen Boedtker is one of the employees in risk
- 13 management.
- **14** Q. How often did you communicate with Karen Boedtker?
- 15 A. In the -- it would ebb and flow. Sometimes it was
- a couple of times a month. Sometimes I'd go several
- months without communicating with her.
- **18** Q. And what is the role of risk management at
- 19 Dartmouth-Hitchcock?
- 20 A. Can you ask -- are you looking for my impression
- of the role of risk management? I mean, they're
- 22 responsible for a lot of legal things that I'm simply
- 23 not aware of.
- 24 Q. Your understanding of what's, what's their role?
- 25 A. Right. So my understanding is that their role is

- 1 did you ever speak about the general dysfunction of the
- 2 division?
- 3 A. Both.
- 4 Q. Talking first about the general dysfunction, what
- 5 was the nature of those conversations?
- 6 A. The nature of those conversations was typically in
- 7 the context of one of the patient complaints. But so
- 8 we'd get a complaint, and we'd be talking about that,
- 9 and then I'd be able to say, but, generally, it's, it's
- not likely I'm going to be able to ask these nurses to
- 11 communicate differently, because they simply won't.
- 12 You know, there's a level of dysfunction here that is
- 13 beyond my ability to change people's personalities, and
- 14 so my responsibility working with risk management was
- to help them understand the context of the situation as
- 16 well.
- 17 Q. What response did you get from risk management
- when you brought up these issues of what you perceived
- as the general dysfunction of the division?
- 20 A. I don't remember.
- 21 Q. Do you remember generally what they said?
- 22 A. I remember generally that they were trying as hard
- as I was to try to deal with these patient complaints
- and that there was sort of a general disheartening
- among all of us that, that we kept having to have these

CONFIDENTIAL

Page 70 CONFIDENTIAL

Page 72

- 1 to help us make sure that we appropriately deal with
- 2 any sort of complications or, or issues around patient
- 3 complaints or any sort of clinical, clinical
- 4 complications. So my, my interaction with them was
- 5 typically with patient complaints or if one of our
- 6 providers would say, Hey, I'm going to give risk
- 7 management a heads up because of something that
- 8 happened with a patient's care.
- **9** Q. Did you ever take issues to risk management?
- 10 A. Just myself?
- 11 O. Yes. Based on something that you saw or heard
- about or understood to be going on.
- 13 A. I don't remember. I don't remember if there were
- 14 situations where it was just me going or if it was just
- me working with the, the group that was brought
- 16 forward.
- 17 Q. And did you talk with anybody about, at risk
- management, about issues in the REI division?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. Who did you speak to?
- 21 A. I worked with Karen Boedtker quite a bit. I
- worked with Michele King also, and then some other
- 23 people in patient relations. I don't remember his
- 24 name
- 25 Q. Did you speak with them about specific issues, or

- 1 phone calls.
- 2 Q. Over what period of time did you bring complaints
- 3 to risk management?
- 4 A. I don't remember.
- 5 O. Was it throughout the whole time that there was
- 6 the REI division?
- **7** A. It was probably a two- to three-year period.
- 8 There were periods of time when I first started where I
- 9 would hear from Dr. Porter or one of the nurses that
- they were going to fire a patient and that they were
- 11 working with, with risk management, and so I may or may
- not be involved in taking a look at that as well.
- 13 Q. Were there any patient safety concerns that you
- 14 brought to risk management?
- 15 A. Not that I remember.
- 16 Q. Do you know if anybody else brought patient safety
- 17 concerns to risk management regarding the REI division?
- **18** A. I don't know.
- 19 Q. What was your impression of the relationship
- between Dr. Hsu and Karen Boedtker?
- 21 A. I don't know.
- 22 Q. Did you see them interact?
- 23 A. No, not that I remember, no.
- **24** Q. Did you ever observe them talking to each other or about each other?

Misty Blanchette Porter, MD v.

Confidential Heather Gunnell - Vol. 1 Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center, et al. August 2, 2019

1 A. No.

CONFIDENTIAL

- 2 Q. For the patient complaints that you handled that
- went to risk management related to REI, which of the
- physicians within REI were they about?
- 5 A. All of them.
- 6 O. What was the distribution?
- 7 A. I don't remember. The, the vast majority of the
- complaints from patients were more global about the,
- the dysfunction and the breakdown in communication 9
- among the team. So a lot of complaints had to do with 10
- the feeling that patients had that the providers and 11
- the nurses simply were not communicating with one 12
- another about their plan of care. I would receive 13
- complaints that, you know, Dr. Hsu gave me X plan, but 14
- then, when I talked to Dr. Porter two days later, she 15
- gave me a different plan. Which plan am I on? No 16
- one's talking to me. So those type of complaints. 17
- Q. How frequently did something like that happen
- where a patient felt that they were getting conflicting 19
- information from different providers? 20
- 21 A. That escalated, and so those type of complaints
- became more frequent in the year or so -- well, the 22
- timeline's broken up in my mind, because I was on
- maternity leave for a little while, but for, you know, 24
- a year-and-a-half or so prior to the closing, those 25

1 A. No. Again, the clinical piece of it was beyond

Page 75

- my, my scope of management.
- Q. Did you have any either responsibility or
- oversight for assigning patients to certain providers'
- schedules?

CONFIDENTIAL

- A. No. 6
- **7** Q. Who had that responsibility?
- A. So the providers would work with the scheduling
- secretaries to, to map out who would be where, and then
- the scheduling secretaries would book the patients into 10
- 11 those patient slots, and ultrasound was included in
- 12
- O. Did you have any knowledge about Dr. Hsu's 13
- pregnancy rates?
- 15 A. Not really, but I did see some data at one point
- that I believe was sent from Navid about what the
- pregnancy rates for the division were.
- O. Do you remember when that was?
- A. I don't remember. I don't remember if it was
- right before Dr. Seifer started or shortly after.
- Q. Did you receive regular, maybe annual or
- semiannual, reports about the pregnancy rates coming
- out of REI? 23
- 24 A. I did not receive any reports from the BabySentry
- system, which is where that would be held. I would

CONFIDENTIAL Page 74 CONFIDENTIAL

- type of complaints became more frequent.
- **2** Q. Why do you think they became more frequent?
- 3 A. Because the team was dysfunctional and would not
- communicate with one another, so patients would call to
- complain more.
- 6 Q. Did the team get more dysfunctional over time?
- Q. Did it get more dysfunctional when David Seifer
- came on board?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 O. We'll talk about David Seifer in a little bit.
- Going back to Dr. Hsu, what was your understanding of
- what procedures Dr. Hsu could perform? 13
- 14 A. I don't remember specifics. I do remember that he
- was not a full-scope surgeon in the same way that 15
- Dr. Porter was. 16
- 17 Q. What do you mean by full-scope surgeon?
- 18 A. So Dr. Porter did quite a bit more GYN surgery
- than Dr. Hsu did, and my understanding is that Dr. Hsu
- stayed much tighter to just a, like an REI provider, 20
- whereas Dr. Porter did, did more of those cases. 21
- 22 Q. Was Dr. Hsu able to read ultrasounds?
- 23 A. He did read ultrasounds, yes.
- 24 Q. Did you have any understanding of his level of
- competency in reading ultrasounds?

- hear anecdotally about, about the pregnancy rates, but
- that was not a data point that came across my desk
- 3 regularly.
- 4 Q. Do you know why it wasn't?
- A. I don't know why.
- Q. It seems, it seems important to the functionality
- of REI. I'm surprised that that information didn't
- come to you. Did you go looking for it?
- 9 A. Looking for the pregnancy rates?
- Yes. 10 Q.
- A. No.
- 12 Q. Why not?
- 13 A. Because, again, the, the clinical piece of that,
- we have division directors, we had a chair, we had the
- lab director. All of those people paid attention to 15
- that. That was part of the clinical piece that they 16
- were responsible for, and I was primarily responsible 17
- for the operations and the finances. 18
- Q. What did you hear anecdotally about Dr. Hsu's 19
- pregnancy rates? 20
- A. It depended on who I was talking to. So I would
- hear from some people like Dr. Porter that they were
- 23 low, but then I would also hear from Dr. DeMars that
- they were actually fairly normal, and so, having not 24
- seen the data, I wasn't quite sure where that actually

Heather Gunnell - Vol. 1 August 2, 2019

Page 131

Page 132

CONFIDENTIAL

- around that.
- 2 Q. Did you hear concerns about whether Dr. Hsu was
- managing those issues appropriately?
- 4 A. I don't remember.
- 5 Q. How about with Dr. Seifer?
- 6 A. I don't remember.
- **7** O. Who is Beth Todd?
- 8 A. Beth Todd was the nurse practitioner assigned to
- the REI division.
- 10 Q. And did she work primarily in REI?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. What makes you say that?
- 13 A. Because she worked primarily with REI and did some
- GYN care as well.
- 15 Q. How much GYN care did she do?
- A. I don't know the exact distribution.
- Q. What was the scope of her practice?
- A. I know she worked with -- she did some general GYN
- care. She worked with the REI providers, did IUIs.
- I'm not sure exactly what you're asking me. 20
- 21 Q. It sounds like that may get into more of the
- clinical side, which is outside the range of what it

1 Q. All right. So we're going to fast-forward a bit,

and I think we will, we'll rewind later, but I would

like to now move to the period of time in mid to late

April 2017 around the time that discussions about what

to do with REI were really heating up. What was

- sounds like you're familiar with. Is that, is that
- true? 24

3

4

5

25 A. Yeah. Yes.

CONFIDENTIAL Page 129

- that might be useful for setting some context.
- A. Okay.
- Q. Can you do that? 3
- A. Yes. So, so, generally, I don't remember the
- exact timeframe, but that six- to eight-months 5
- timeframe we were working with the Value Institute and 6
- 7 some other teams in Dartmouth-Hitchcock to bring the
- group together to work on the interpersonal dynamics, 8
- the communication, and more broadly the various work
- flows and, and paths for managing patients so that 10
- there was some consistency. 11
- The idea was to try to address the, the many 12
- complaints both from patients and staff within that 13
- division to try to bring this together. So we were
- doing that more globally. We were also looking at some 15 pretty significant staffing concerns among, with the 16
- nursing, trying to keep enough nurses to provide the 17
- care safely and keep the division running.
- Q. What were the discussions that you were having 19
- with anybody at that time about what to do with REI?
- A. At that time, the real focus was on we just want 21
- to shore this team up. We need to, we need to figure
- out the, the dysfunction. We need to get them to
- communicate together. Let's give all of the resources 24
- that we have available to us to see if we can bring

CONFIDENTIAL

Page 130

this group together and make this work.

Q. What time period was that?

CONFIDENTIAL

- 3 A. I think we started the conversations with the
- Value Institute in the fall, maybe late fall of 2016.
- There were a couple of retreats. I believe there was 5
- one in January, February. It was an ongoing process
- 7 with some really dedicated time off site. I don't
- remember the exact dates of that, though.
- Q. At some point, was there a working group put
- together to figure out what to do with REI?
- A. What do you mean, a working group?
- Q. Maybe that's not the right term, but a smaller
- group of people who, including you, who were tasked
- with figuring out what was happening to REI?
- A. I don't know that there was really a group put
- together for that. I mean, I certainly brought my
- concerns to Dr. DeMars and said, "I think we should 17
- reach out to the Value Institute. I think we need to 18
- put this group together". I worked directly with many
- of those people to, to prepare for those retreats, to 20
- pull together documents, but it wasn't necessarily a 21
- formally formed group, if that makes sense.
- 23

(Deposition Exhibit 5 marked.)

- Q. I think so. This has been marked as Gunnell 5.
- Let me know when you're ready.

7 A. I'm, I'm trying to remember, because there was so

much that happened in that division in that, like,

happening in the REI division in April 2017?

six-, eight-month time period. I believe --

Q. What -- sorry. What six- to eight-month time

- period are you talking about, the six to eight months
- before the closure?
- 13 A. That's correct.
- 14 Q. Okay.
- A. I believe in April is when we found ourselves
- losing the last fully trained REI nurse. I don't 16
- remember exactly when she gave her notice, but I 17
- believe that timeframe was when we were looking at 18 significant staffing issues. 19
- 20 Q. Was that Marlene in Bedford?
- 21 A. That's correct.
- 22 Q. Would you be able to give me a, a high-level,
- 23 fairly brief overview of what was happening in that
- six- to eight-month time period, understanding that

we'll come back and sort of drill down? But I think

Min-U-Script®

Misty Blanchette Porter, MD v. Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center, et al. Heather Gunnell - Vol. 1 August 2, 2019

Page 135

Page 136

CONFIDENTIAL

- **1** A. Okay. I'm ready.
- 2 Q. So this is Gunnell Exhibit 5, DH9582 and a number
- 3 of pages after that in attachment to this email. This,
- 4 the cover page is emails back and forth between you,
- 5 Daniel Herrick, and Leslie DeMars. Looking at this
- 6 email and the attachment, does this refresh your memory
- 7 about some of the conversations in this time period?
- 8 This email is dated April 19th 2017, and, before we get
- 9 into the specifics of this, I'm wondering if you could
- 10 explain to me more of the context of what was going on
- 11 at this time period.
- 12 A. Yes, this, this helps me remember this particular
- time period. So, best of my recollection, at this
- 14 point the decision had been made to close the division,
- and so I was working with Daniel on, on that process.
- 16 Q. When you say "the decision had been made", who
- 17 made the decision?
- **18** A. My understanding is that Dr. Merrens made that
- 19 decision.
- 20 Q. What do you know about the discussions that led to
- 21 that decision?
- 22 A. I wasn't involved in the discussions about
- 23 closing, closing the division. So my understanding is
- 24 that there were several conversations, particularly
- after the end of the Value Institute work, between

CONFIDENTIAL

- 1 that decision?
- 2 A. I don't know.
- 3 Q. Did you provide information? Did you provide any
- 4 information directly to Dr. Merrens?
- 5 A. Not directly to Dr. Merrens.
- 6 Q. How about indirectly?
- 7 A. I provided information to Daniel.
- 8 Q. What information did you give to Daniel?
- 9 A. Anything that he asked for. So some of it is
- 10 right in here.

11

- (Indicating Exhibit 5.)
- **12** Q. What did he ask for?
- 13 A. So I don't remember all of the details. I
- 14 remember being asked to provide an ROI.
- 15 Q. What's an ROI?
- 16 A. A return on investment, so the financial data
- around the REI division, working with our financial
- **18** analyst at the time.
- 19 Q. How would one calculate a return on investment for
- 20 a clinical division?
- 21 A. So finance would take a look at all of the
- expenses and all of the incoming revenue around a
- 23 division and put together a financial package for that.
- 24 Q. Is it your understanding that the financial
- 25 picture around REI was a part of the decision about

CONFIDENTIAL

- Daniel Herrick and Dr. DeMars and that, and that they,
- 2 there was a recommendation given to senior leadership,
- 3 including Dr. Merrens.
- 4 Q. A recommendation by whom?
- 5 A. I believe that Daniel Herrick recommended, after
- 6 the last nurse left, that, that the program be closed
- 7 down.
- 8 Q. When did the last nurse leave?
- **9** A. I don't remember exactly.
- 10 Q. Was Marti Lewis still in the division at the time
- it shut down?
- 12 A. Yes, she was.
- 13 Q. And, when you say "last nurse", do you, are you
- 14 referring to Marti, or are you talking about somebody
- 15 else?
- 16 A. I should clarify. The last fully trained nurse
- 17 for the division, who was Marlene in the south.
- 18 Q. How do you know that it was Ed Merrens who made
- the decision to close REI?
- 20 A. I've heard him say that it was his decision.
- 21 Q. When did you hear him say that?
- 22 A. As the, after the program -- I've heard him say it
- on several occasions, and that's how, that's how --
- that's why that's my understanding.
- 25 Q. What information was given to Ed Merrens to make

CONFIDENTIAL

- whether to keep REI open?
- 2 A. My understanding is that that was not part of the
- 3 decision.

Page 134

- 4 Q. What other information did you give to Daniel
- 5 Herrick?
- 6 A. At what point?
- 7 Q. What are the different points that you're thinking
- 8 of?
- 9 A. So I, I know that I tried to keep him up-to-date.
- 10 He was, he was fairly remote during the Value Institute
- 11 process, so I would let him know we're doing X, Y, Z
- 12 retreat for the group. I did communicate to him when
- 13 Marlene gave her notice that I was concerned that we
- 14 were down to having no fully trained nurses in that
- 15 division, and then, when he would request information
- 16 from me, I would, I would give it to him.
- 17 Q. Other than the financial information, what did you 18 give him?
- 19 A. I don't remember all of that. I don't remember
- 20 all the details.
- 21 Q. Did Daniel Herrick ever come down and speak with
- 22 the providers?
- ATTORNEY JOSEPH: That's speculation. You
- 24 can answer.
- 25

Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center, et al.August 2, 2019CONFIDENTIALPage 141 CONFIDENTIALPage 143

1 Q. Did she want to save Dr. Porter's job?

- 2 A. I suspect so. I don't know.
- 3 Q. In the conversations with Dr. DeMars about
- 4 different options for the REI division, did at least
- 5 some of those variations include retaining Dr. Porter
- as an employee of Dartmouth-Hitchcock?
- 7 A. Yes, yes.
- 8 Q. Did any of those variations include terminating
- **9** Dr. Seifer and Dr. Hsu only?
- 10 A. I don't remember Dr. DeMars talking specifically
- 11 about terminating anybody.
- **12** Q. Do you remember her talking generally about moving
- 13 some people out, something other than as strong a word
- as "terminate", but maybe something, a looser idea?
- 15 A. My conversations with Dr. DeMars about this
- 16 process felt very much -- my impression of them was
- very much that she was in denial that the, that the
- 18 division needed to be closed and, instead, was
- 19 searching for ways to try to keep things going.
- 20 Q. What did you understand your role to be in that
- 21 process?
- 22 A. In which process?
- 23 Q. The process of figuring out what to do with REI.
- 24 A. I understood very clearly that it was not my, I
- 25 had no authority to make that decision, and so, during

- 1 understand just how tenuous the situation in the
- 2 division was.
- 3 Q. Why did you think the proposals for getting
- 4 nursing staff were not realistic?
- 5 A. Well, it depends on the proposal. So, for
- 6 example, one of them was, We can just take some
- 7 procedure nurses from New London Hospital and, and
- 8 bring them in and have them help with this, and it,
- 9 it's not realistic to be able to do that in a week. So
- It's not realistic to be able to do that in a week. So
- some of the suggestions were simply not realistic to be able to do in the timeframe necessary, and it was also
- incredibly difficult for us to hire qualified nurses.
- 13 REI nurses are difficult to find trained, and there was
- 14 a nursing shortage throughout the institution, and REI
- had a reputation for not being a great place for nurses
- to work. So it was a very complicated dynamic.
- 17 Q. I'm surprised by your statement that the, the
- 18 providers in REI were in denial of how dire the
- situation was, because they were the ones living it
- 20 day-to-day. Can you explain more why you thought the
- 21 providers who were living this day-to-day were in
- denial about the reality of the situation?
- 23 A. So the situation I'm speaking about in particular
- was the reality of how, how difficult it is to hire and
- 25 train nurses. So I suspect that they knew things were

CONFIDENTIAL Page 142 CONFIDENTIAL Page 144

- 1 those conversations, it was, it was my responsibility
- 2 to sort of talk to her and look at the reality of the
- 3 situation.
- 4 Q. It sounds to me like you have a, you had a clear
- 5 feeling of what should be done. What was your feeling
- 6 about what should have, what should be done with REI in
- 7 that period of late April 2017?
- 8 A. I, it was complicated. I, I did not actually
- 9 expect us to get to a place. I kept wanting to try to
- 10 find a way for us to keep going. When the last nurse
- 11 gave her notice, I wasn't sure how we were going to do
- **12** that.
- 13 Q. How you were going to keep going?
- **14** A. How we were going to keep the division functioning
- and be able to provide safe care for the patients, and
- 16 I was very concerned that the team did not have a
- 17 realistic view of just how dire that situation was.
- **18** Q. What team are you referring to?
- 19 A. I'm referring to the REI providers and Dr. DeMars.
- 20 Q. What did you hear from the providers about their
- perspective on what was going on?
- 22 A. I often heard various suggestions on how to get
- 23 nursing staff that were not particularly realistic,
- and, and I did not hear any of them really understand
- just how complicated the situation was or really

- 1 difficult, but they did not seem to have a real
- 2 understanding of why it was difficult to bring nurses
- 3 in and did not seem to understand why I couldn't just
- 4 make it happen in two days. So that's the, that's the
- 5 situation specifically that I'm talking about.
- 6 Q. As of April 2017, what efforts were being made to
- 7 recruit nurses to REI?
- 8 A. As of April, at this point? So we had open
- 9 positions. We had been interviewing people. We had
- been looking into per diems. HR, at the end of the
- Value Institute process and that team dynamic, we were told by -- we meaning Dr. DeMars, Dr. Seifer, Daniel
- Herrick, and I -- were told that, with the nursing
- shortage in the institution and very clearly that the
- 15 team was not coming together, HR would not actively
- 16 help us recruit for our nursing positions when there
- were so many other positions open.
- **18** Q. And that was February 2017?
- 19 A. I don't remember exactly when that was.
- 20 Q. If I'm understanding this correctly then, from
- approximately February 2017 until the closure, there
- was no authorization to hire nurses into the REI
- 23 division?
- 24 A. I don't know that there was a very clear, like,
- 25 drop-off. We had active positions, and, when we had

CONFIDENTIAL Page 145 CONFIDENTIAL Page 147

- 1 candidates, we would call them in, and we were doing
- 2 our best, but it was very clear from HR that, unless
- 3 that dynamic could be fixed, they would not make us a
- 4 priority.
- **5** Q. How hard is it to train an otherwise competent and
- 6 skilled nurse to become an REI-specific nurse?
- 7 A. It's a, it's a long process to make sure that they
- 8 are fully competent in all of those areas.
- **9** Q. How long?
- 10 A. Depends on the nurse, but several months.
- 11 Q. What's the basis for your understanding?
- 12 A. The basis for my understanding is the various
- 13 nurses who had come into the division and the process
- by which they were trained. The specifics of that are
- better left to my nurse manager than me, but, but it
- was certainly a long onboarding process.
- 17 Q. In Exhibit 5 here you say, "My assumption is that
- 18 MBP will be refocused to GYN ultrasound". Why was that
- 19 your assumption?
- 20 A. Because that's, that is based on my conversations
- 21 with Dr. DeMars.
- 22 Q. When you built this in, this assumption, to the
- plan, was it your understanding that this was
- 24 definitely the plan, or was this simply one of the
- variations that you mentioned Dr. DeMars had spoken to

OOMITBENTIAL

1 A. I don't know.

- 2 Q. Did you hear anything about that?
- 3 A. No.
- 4 Q. In this process did you ever talk to Dr. DeMars

August 2, 2019

- 5 about patient demand for services that Dr. Porter could
- 6 provide?
- 7 A. No.
- 8 Q. Why not?
- 9 A. What do you mean?
- 10 Q. Why not?
- 11 A. So my understanding in communications with
- 12 Dr. DeMars was that much of which, much of the care,
- particularly surgical care, could be provided by the
- 14 generalist team. If REI was closing down, then there
- was no need for that patient care. There were
- 16 conversations about how we would get patients that care
- 17 elsewhere.
- **18** Q. I see that it's about 3:00 o'clock. Would you
- 19 like to take a break?
- 20 A. I'm doing okay right now.
- 21 Q. You're doing okay? Okay. Good. Looking at this
- document, still Exhibit 5, I see that on the, the
- 23 second-to-last page with the "Future Staff with
- 24 Complete REI Shutdown" is the middle column. What do
- you understand that scenario to be?

CONFIDENTIAL Page 146 CONFIDENTIAL Page 148

- 1 you about?
- 2 A. This was simply one of the variations.
- 3 Q. Did you understand it to be the top choice for
- 4 among those variations?
- 5 A. So this is one of the examples that I alluded to
- 6 earlier today in which I said the information that I
- 7 would be given by Dr. DeMars that I would move forward
- 8 on sometimes turned out to not be, I would not have the

full context. This is one of those examples. So this

- 10 plan was based on my conversations with Dr. DeMars.
- pian was based on my conversations with Dr. Delvian
- 11 Q. Did you think that she was telling different
- things to different people?
- 13 A. I don't know.
- 14 Q. You mention here the staffing plan for both a
- 15 complete shutdown and a rebuild. Are those two
- 16 different alternative plans?
- 17 A. I don't remember.
- **18** Q. You said that the information you had gotten from
- 19 Dr. DeMars was the basis for your assumption that
- 20 Dr. Porter, MBP, would be refocused to GYN ultrasound.
- 21 Do you know if that plan changed when Dr. DeMars spoke
- 22 to Daniel Herrick?
- 23 A. I don't know.
- 24 Q. Do you know what it was that caused that plan to
- 25 change?

- 1 A. So I understand this scenario to be the difference
- 2 between what the division currently looked like with
- 3 what might happen after the closure if Beth Todd was
- 4 retained and moved to the generalist division to
- 5 provide GYN care and Dr. Porter was retained to
- 6 continue with GYN ultrasound.
- 7 Q. Do you know, as of that time, how much of
- 8 Dr. Porter's time was devoted to GYN ultrasound?
- **9** A. My recollection is that most of the time when she
- was working was devoted to ultrasound.
- 11 O. In that period in 2017?
- 12 A. Correct.
- 13 Q. And that was, really, that was a generalist
- 14 service, not REI-specific?
- 15 A. I'm, I'm not sure.
- 16 Q. Did she -- she looked at ultrasounds. Maybe you
- 17 don't know. Do you know if she, as part of that GYN
- 18 ultrasound work, looked at ultrasounds that were not
- 19 REI-specific?
- 20 A. My understanding is that, yes, there was some GYN
- 21 ultrasound that was not REI-specific.
- 22 Q. You mentioned a moment ago that the, the
- 23 generalists would be able to take over the surgical
- work that Dr. Porter had done. Did you talk to
- 25 Dr. Tyler at all, Dr. Regan Tyler, at all about the

CONFIDENTIAL CONFIDENTIAL Page 169 Page 171

- that point in time that there were patients scheduled
- for June and July in addition to May?
- 3 A. Yes, but I don't remember what they were scheduled
- for or where they were in cycle.
- 5 Q. Would that have made a difference?
- 6 A. A difference to what?
- 7 Q. How concerned everybody would be about leaving
- them hanging.
- 9 A. I don't know. I know that the primary concern
- from my perspective at this point was that we didn't 10
- have nursing staff to safely shepherd these patients 11
- 12 through.
- Q. Were there -- there were no solutions to that, to 13
- bring somebody in, other than just closing?
- A. Could you rephrase that for me, please?
- Q. I'm trying to understand what your position is on
- there not being nursing staff and the concern for 17
- patients in the absence of sufficient nurses.
- A. So, at this point, we, Sharon had retired. Casey 19
- 20 was no longer with us. Marlene had given her notice.
- There was one RN who was still not fully trained to 21
- manage that division and a couple of LPNs who could do 22
- 23 some work, but not near enough that was necessary. So
- I was concerned the day I heard Marlene was giving her 24
- notice that we would not have sufficient trained

- from the announcement to the actual end?
- 2 Q. Yes.
- з A. Yes.
- 4 Q. What were those discussions?
- A. I don't remember all of the details of those
- discussions, and I don't think I was part of all of

August 2, 2019

- 7 those discussions either.
- Q. Can you tell me about the ones that you were a
- part of? 9
- A. So I don't remember all of these details. I 10
- remember trying to figure out how can we, how can we
- navigate not having appropriate staff and not being 12
- able to provide appropriate care with managing the 13
- patients who are currently in cycle and what is it that
- we can do to, to bridge that gap. So I do remember 15
- having those conversations and looking at how many
- patients that we had in cycle and where they were and,
- and who, who their provider was. I do remember looking
- at that. 19
- Q. Who did you talk to about this? 20
- A. I remember talking to Dr. DeMars about it. I
- don't remember if I spoke to Daniel Herrick about it or
- 23
- 24 Q. How many times did you talk to Dr. DeMars about
- 25 it?

CONFIDENTIAL Page 170 CONFIDENTIAL Page 172

- nursing staff to be able to appropriately run the REI
- division.
- 3 Q. How far in advance had Sharon given notice of her
- plans to retire?
- 5 A. She gave us significant notice. It was several
- Q. What was the response to this email in Gunnell
- Exhibit 7?
- 9 A. I don't remember.
- 10 Q. Were people confused?
- 11 A. I don't remember. I don't remember the response
- to this specific email.
- 13 Q. Did you think that this was appropriate messaging
- to send out at that point in time?
- A. What do you mean by "appropriate messaging"?
- Q. In the context of what you knew about what had
- been decided. 17
- 18 A. I, I don't remember exactly what I was thinking at
- the time. I, I do remember thinking we need to be 19
- thoughtful of about how we roll this out so that we 20
- don't leave, leave patients just, just hanging. 21
- 22 Q. Were there discussions about how to time the
- announcement of the the announcement of the closure
- and then the actual closure?
- 25 A. Were there, were there discussions on how to time

- 1 A. About that specific piece of it, I'm not sure.
- 2 Q. How many times do you think you talked to
- Dr. DeMars about the REI closure in general?
- A. Every time I met with Dr. DeMars for three years,
- we talked about REI, every time, several times a week.
- So, probably, every time I met with her, we talked
- about this to some degree or another.
- Q. You sound a little frustrated by the amount of
- time that you spent talking about REI. Is that
- accurate? 10
- A. That's accurate, yes.
- Q. Can you tell me more about that, about the, those
- feelings of frustration? 13
- A. Yes. It, it was very frustrating, I think, as I
- said earlier today, the inordinate amount of time spent 15
- 16 on managing that division and its complications
- compared to the scope of my actual job. To some 17
- degree, it was frustrating to feel like I'm not likely 18 to be able to solve these problems, because these 19
- problems are above my pay grade, and I can't change 20
- personalities. And so it was frustrating to feel like
- 21 I was just spinning my wheels year after year, and it
- 23 was frustrating to know that the time I was spending
- with REI could probably be better focused somewhere 24
- else in the department. 25

CONFIDENTIAL CONFIDENTIAL Page 189 Page 191

- me that everyone involved in that was leaving.
- 2 Q. Did you think that closure was the right decision?
- 3 A. At that time, at that time, I hadn't -- you know,
- I was not in a space to be able to really process it.
- I was just trying to make sure things happened. In
- hindsight now, yes, I think that was probably the right
- decision.
- Q. At the time you had had a few weeks to process 8
- what was happening, in that time did you have a sense
- that it was the right thing to be doing? 10
- 11 A. Again, during that time, I was just trying to make
- 12 sure that things happened, so, so I'm still processing.
- Q. It seems in some ways like it was a pretty quick
- period of time between the decision to close and the
- 15 announcement. Is that how it feels to you?
- 16 A. I think it was a short period of time. However,
- it, we also didn't have a nurse, right? So, when that, 17
- when Marlene gave her notice, it was no longer safe to
- continue care, and so, from my perspective, the 19
- timeframe was likely more around the, the safety of 20
- our, of our patients and how to navigate that. So 21
- that's the way I see that timeframe. 22
- O. Did you think it was the right decision to
- terminate Dr. Porter?
- 25 A. Yes.

1 Q. Were you able to contact all of the patients?

August 2, 2019

- 2 A. I believe so.
- 3 Q. What was the message that you were giving
- patients?
- A. I don't remember the exact talking points.
- Q. Do you remember generally if there was anything
- that you were supposed to say or not supposed to say?
- A. I don't remember.
- Q. Were you supposed to tell people that it was
- because of provider dysfunction?
- 11 A. That was not one of the talking points.
- 12 Q. Do you think that was the reason for the closure?
- A. I don't think it was the whole reason for the
- closure, no.
- 15 Q. But part of the reason?
- 16 A. I think that, had we been able to keep and retain
- and train nurses, we would have kept trying to solve
- 18 the dysfunction.
- Q. I'm sorry. Can you say that again? 19
- A. I think that, had we been able to get nursing
- staff and keep nursing staff, we would have continued
- to try to work with that team and overcome the
- dysfunction of the team. 23
- Q. And the problem there was HR saying that you
- couldn't continue to recruit nursing staff?

CONFIDENTIAL Page 190 CONFIDENTIAL Page 192

- 1 O. Why?
- 2 A. Because, when we're looking at the dynamics and
- the dysfunction of that team, she was a central part of
- that, and I am not convinced that the team, any team
- would be able to have a healthy dynamic if she was at 5
- the center of it.
- Q. What if she had been redeployed to do GYN
- ultrasound?
- **9** A. I don't know.
- 10 Q. So you said that Dr. DeMars took off in the
- morning of May 4th. When did she come back?
- 12 A. She was headed to a conference, and I don't
- remember how long the conference was, but it was at 13
- least a couple of days. 14
- 15 Q. So let's go back, and, and can you tell me more
- about the response when you were there making these
- announcements? What else happened the rest of the day 17
- on May 4th? 18
- A. I don't remember. I don't remember. Oh, I do. 19
- We spent a fair amount of time communicating with 20
- people after the department was made aware of the 21
- decision. Then we deployed several people -- I don't 22
- 23 remember exactly who -- to start contacting patients to
- let them know. We wanted patients to hear it directly
- from us prior to hearing it in the newspaper. 25

- - 1 A. I don't think that was the core problem, because
 - we had had issues recruiting nursing long before HR
 - 3 made that decision.
 - 4 Q. It sounds like there was a nursing shortage
 - throughout the department, right?
 - A. Throughout the institution.
 - Q. Throughout the institution? How much worse was it
 - in REI than in the rest of the department?
 - A. Worse. It was harder to get nurses, and I think
 - particularly because of the, the skill set required and
 - the, the hours required for that division.
 - Q. You said a little bit ago that you didn't think
 - that any division would be functional with Dr. Porter
 - in it or words to that effect. What's the basis for
 - that statement? 15
 - A. So I, I don't think I meant any division. I don't
 - think that we could have brought new people into an REI 17
 - division with that. I know that, largely, Dr. Porter 18
 - could be very difficult to work with. So I don't know 19
 - whether or not it would have been as difficult if it 20
 - was just ultrasound. I honestly don't know. 21
 - 22 Q. What made Dr. Porter difficult to work with?
 - A. Things with Dr. Porter were very much her way or no way, and it was difficult to find a level of
 - compromise. 25

23